UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/904,734	07/13/2001	Debasish Banerjee	ROC920010101US1	3372

7590 09/22/2005

IBM Corporation
Intellectual Property Law, Dept. 917
3605 Highway 52 North
Rochester, MN 55901-7829

EXAMINER	
NGUYEN BA, PAUL H	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2176	

DATE MAILED: 09/22/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/904,734	BANERJEE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Paul Nguyen-Ba	2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *27 June 2005*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-27* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-27* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *6/29/2005*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Notice to Applicant

1. This action is responsive to:

   a. Applicant's Amendments and Remarks filed on 6/27/2005, and

   b. Information Disclosure Statement (IDS) filed on 6/29/2005.

2. Claims 1-27 are currently pending. Claims 1, 12, and 16 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1, 3-5, 7-9, 12-14, 16, 18-20, and 22-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Veditz et al. ("Veditz"), U.S. Patent No. 6,496,793, in view of Watanabe et al. ("Watanabe"), U.S. Patent No. 6,185,729.

Veditz teaches a method of determining character sets (see Abstract):

Independent Claim 1

comprising **at least one of**:

(a) *selecting a character set for a client request from a client to a server, the selecting comprising:*

determining whether the client request includes a request character set designation (Fig. 3A – 303 → checks LDID in data file (i.e. stored in header file); Fig. 2C → file header);

if the client request does not include the request character set designation, retrieving locale information contained in the client request (Fig. 3B → compares LDID of data file to Active LDID; see also col. 3, lines 29-31); *and*

associating the locale information with the request character set designation using mapping data located on the server (Fig. 2B → if Active LDID is not equal to Local LDID it maps the Local LDID into the Active LDID; see also col. 3, lines 54-60; col. 7, lines 52-64; col. 18, lines 21-26); and

(b) *selecting a response character set for a server response from the server to the client, the selecting comprising:*

determining whether the server response includes a response character set designation (Fig. 3A – 303 → checks LDID in data file (i.e. stored in header file); Fig. 2C → file header);

if the server response does not include the response character set designation, retrieving locale information contained in the server response (Fig. 3B → compares LDID of data file to Active LDID; see also col. 3, lines 29-31); *and*

associating the locale information contained in the server response with the response character set designation using the mapping data (Fig. 2B → if Active LDID is

not equal to Local LDID it maps the Local LDID into the Active LDID; see also col. 3, lines 54-60; col. 7, lines 52-64; col. 18, lines 21-26).

Veditz does not specifically teach client-server communications, including using a network communication protocol. However, Watanabe teaches a method and system for developing and testing internationalized software including a multibyte English locale directed to a network communication protocol for the purpose of transferring locale information over computer networks (see col. 5 lines 34-46, col. 6 lines 8-28).

Since Veditz and Watanabe are both from the same field of endeavor, the purposes disclosed by Watanabe would have been recognized in the pertinent art of Veditz. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to modify the teaching of Veditz with the teachings of Watanabe to include client-server communications, including using a network communication protocol for the purpose of transferring locale information over computer networks.

Claim 3

wherein associating comprises accessing a character set lookup table that maps the locale information to the request character set designation and response request character set designation, respectively (see Fig. 2C → "LDID Lookup Table;" see also col. 4, lines 36-39 → i.e. code page).

Claim 4

further comprising associating the request character set designation with a code-set converter designation by accessing a converter lookup table which maps the code-set converter designation with the request character set designation (see Fig. 2C → i.e. "LDID Value;" see also col. 14, lines 49-60).

Claim 5

wherein the locale information contains a cultural language preference identifier (col. 11, lines 5-18 → user may specify language preferences (i.e. default values).

Claim 7

further comprising associating the request character set designation with a code-set converter designation (Fig. 2C; col. 13, lines 10-67 to col. 14, lines 1-62).

Claim 8

wherein the code-set converter designation is contained in a lookup table and is mapped with response character set designation (Fig. 2B, 2C; col. 13, lines 10-67 to col. 14, lines 1-62).

Claim 9

wherein the code-set converter designation is indicative of user specific implementations of character sets (Fig. 2C; col. 12 clines 37-42 *et seq.*).

Independent Claim 12

Claim 12 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claim 1, and is rejected along the same rationale.

Claim 13

Claim 13 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claim 7, and is rejected along the same rationale.

Claim 14

Claim 14 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claim 5, and is rejected along the same rationale.

Independent Claim 16

Claim 16 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claim 1, and is rejected along the same rationale.

Claim 18

Claim 18 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claim 3, and is rejected along the same rationale.

Claim 19

Claim 19 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claim 4, and is rejected along the same rationale.

Claim 20

Claim 20 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claim 5, and is rejected along the same rationale.

Claim 22

Claim 22 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claim 7, and is rejected along the same rationale.

Claim 23

Claim 23 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claim 8, and is rejected along the same rationale.

Claim 24

Claim 24 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claim 9, and is rejected along the same rationale.

5. Claims 2, 6, 10, 11, 17, 21, 26, and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Veditz et al. ("Veditz"), U.S. Patent No. 6,496,793, in view of Horn et al. ("Horn"), U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0156688.

Claim 2

Veditz teaches a method of determining character sets of client-server communications with respect to independent claim 1 as discussed above, but does not specifically teach the client request and server response being formatted as HTTP.

However, Horn teaches client request and server responses formatted in HTTP (see [109], [156], and [202]) for the purpose of defining how messages are formatted and transmitted, and what actions Web servers and browsers should take in response to various commands.

Since Horn and Veditz are both from the same field of endeavor, the purposes disclosed by Horn would have been recognized in the pertinent art of Veditz. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to modify the teaching of Veditz with the teachings of Horn to include client request and server responses formatted in HTTP (see [109], [156], and [202]) for the purpose of defining how messages are formatted and transmitted, and what actions Web servers and browsers should take in response to various commands.

Claim 6

Veditz teaches a method of determining character sets of client-server communications with respect to independent claim 1 as discussed above, but does not specifically teach the character set designations containing an IANA character set parameter.

However, Horn teaches the character set designations containing an IANA character set parameter (see [178]) for the purpose of preserving the central coordinating functions of the global Internet for the public good.

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to modify the teaching of Veditz with the teachings of Horn to include the character set designations containing an IANA character set parameter (see [178]) for the purpose of preserving the central coordinating functions of the global Internet for the public good.

Claims 10 and 11

Veditz teaches a method of determining character sets of client-server communications with respect to independent claim 1 as discussed above, but does not specifically teach converting the client request into Unicode characters and converting the response from Unicode characters to the character set associated with the locale information.

However, Horn teaches the use of Unicode, a fixed-width, 16-bit worldwide character-encoding standard for the purpose of simplifying localization of software and improving multilingual text processing (see [0293]).

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to modify the teaching of Veditz with the teachings of Horn to include converting the client request into Unicode characters and converting the response from Unicode characters to the character set associated with the locale information standard for the purpose of simplifying localization of software and improving multilingual text processing.

Claim 17

Claim 17 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claim 2, and is rejected along the same rationale.

Claim 21

Claim 21 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claim 6, and is rejected along the same rationale.

Claim 26

Claim 26 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claim 10, and is rejected along the same rationale.

Claim 27

Claim 27 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claim 11, and is rejected along the same rationale.

6. Claims 15 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Veditz et al. ("Veditz"), U.S. Patent No. 6,496,793, in view of Kan et al. ("Kan"), U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0088544.

Claim 15

Veditz teaches the system with respect to independent claim 12 as discussed above, but does not specifically teach a *JVM code-set converter*.

However, Kan teaches a peer-to-peer network executing on a Java Virtual Machine (JVM) for the purpose of providing inter-operability between compliant software components (see [0298], [0315]).

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to modify the teaching of Veditz with the teachings of Kan to include a Java Virtual Machine (JVM) for the purpose of providing inter-operability between compliant software components.

Claim 25

Claim 25 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claim 15, and is rejected along the same rationale.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed 6/27/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant first contends that Veditz does not teach referring to two types of data (character set designation and locale information).

Examiner respectfully disagrees. Veditz clearly teaches referring to *character set designations* (see col. 7 lines 61 *et seq.*). Actual language configuration is effected through one or more Language Drivers, which reference the most appropriate character set designations from the code pages (see col. 8 lines 5-67 *et seq.* and Fig. 2A – 247). Veditz also clearly teaches references to *locale information* (see col. 13 lines 1-67 to col. 14 lines 1-44 → locale lookup tables). Therefore, Veditz clearly teaches reference to two types of data, namely character set designation and locale information.

Applicant further contends that Veditz does not teach using information from a client request.

Examiner agrees with Applicant insofar as Veditz does not explicitly teach using information from a client request. However, Examiner points out that this limitation was rendered obvious with the addition of the Watanabe reference as discussed in the previous office action.

As previously discussed, Watanabe teaches a method and system for developing and testing internationalized software including a multibyte English locale directed to a network

communication protocol for the purpose of transferring locale information over computer networks (see col. 5 lines 34-46, col. 6 lines 8-28). Since it is inherent that networks communication architecture

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to modify the teaching of Veditz with the teachings of Watanabe to include client-server communications, including using a network communication protocol for the purpose of transferring locale information over computer networks - since a network is fundamentally a client/server architecture for sending and receiving information.

Applicant lastly contends that Veditz does not teach "determining whether a client request includes data; rather, Veditz teaches a mere comparison of data..."

Examiner respectfully disagrees. As shown in Figs. 2C and 3A – 303, Veditz teaches checking for identifier data stored in the header (or at any location) of the data file (see also col. 16 lines 51 –63). It is only *after* determining that no identifier data exists, that a comparison of data takes place. Therefore, Veditz, in view of Watanabe, does teach "determining whether a client request includes data".

Conclusion

8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Paul Nguyen-Ba whose telephone number is (571) 272-4094. The examiner can normally be reached on 11 am - 7 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on (571) 272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

PNB

William L Bashore
WILLIAM BASHORE
PRIMARY EXAMINER
9/17/2005